Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/540,790	BOURDONCLE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeff H. Aftergut	1791
II Participants: Status of Application: new application		
(1) Jeff H. Aftergut.	(3)	
(2) <u>Charles Gagnebin</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: #January 2008	Time:	•
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:	·	·
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed: all		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	ne examiner will provide a writt record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
	,	•
· 1 11 14 -+		
(Examiner SPE Signature) (Applican	nt/Applicant's Representative S	ignature – if appropriate)
(-)		· '''''''''

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed the restriction of claim 19 from the remaining claims as it related to an article of manufacture which appears to have been suggested by Herring. Suggested that applicant elect the remaining method claims and cancel the non-elected article claim as the method of manufacture of the article was clearly patentable. Recommended the filing of a divisional application for consideration of the article claims. Applicant's representative agreed to these changes by examiner's amendment.